



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/651,783	08/30/2000	Shuichi Kanno	NIP-198	2461

24956 7590 04/04/2003

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.  
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD  
SUITE 370  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NGOC YEN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1754

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/651,783	KANNO ET AL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ngoc-Yen M. Nguyen	1754

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atobe et al (6,146,606) in view of Ham et al (5,120,516) and optionally further in view of JP 08-318,122 or Lang et al (6,235,256).

Atobe et al '606 discloses that several techniques have been proposed for decomposing nitrogen fluorides contained in the exhaust gas. The methods proposed are classified into (1) decomposition by a reactive agent (catalyst) and (2) decomposition by combustion. The method of converting nitrogen fluoride into stable solid fluorides is not necessarily an easy method because when a metal oxide is used, NO<sub>x</sub> is generated as by-product and a special treatment such as reduction of NO<sub>x</sub> is necessary (note column 1, lines 38-62).

The difference is Atobe '606 does not disclose the step of washing the gas generated by the decomposition and removing mist from the effluent stream after the caustic scrubbing step.

Ham '516 teaches a process for removing NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from combustion effluents (note claim 1 and title). When a wet scrubber is used according to process of

Art Unit: 1754

Ham '516, greater than 90% NO<sub>x</sub> can be removed (note paragraph bridging columns 3-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made use the method as suggested by Ham '516 to remove the NO<sub>x</sub> by produced in the process of Atobe '606 because Atobe '606 teaches the need of removing the NO<sub>x</sub> by product.

Optionally, JP '455 can be applied. JP '455 discloses a process for treating the exhaust gas generated in a process of making printed circuit board by passing the exhaust gas through the catalytic thermal decomposition device 4 and the waste gas cleaning device 5 and discharged as a harmless exhaust gas 6 (note English abstract). As shown in Figure 3, the exhaust gas after scrubber 5 is introduced into a cyclone 8. Here the moisture within the exhaust gas is removed and recycled back to the scrubber 5 thereby minimizes the requirement of fresh scrubbing liquid (note paragraph 0036).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made pass the exhaust gas of the scrubbing column in the combined teaching of Atobe '606 and Ham '516 to a cyclone, as suggested by JP '455 in order to remove the moisture therein and to recycle it to the scrubber.

Alternatively, Lang '256 can be applied. Lang '256 discloses a process for scrubbing acid gases. In the process, the improvement is a demister arranged at a

Application/Control Number: 09/651,783

Art Unit: 1754

location after the liquid droplets have been sprayed by the spray means into the flow path of the flue gases (note column 3, lines 8-43 and claim 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to pass the exhaust gas of the scrubbing column in the combined teaching of Atobe '606 and Ham '516 to a demister, as suggested by Lang '256 in order to obtain the advantages (i.e., improvements) as disclosed in Lang '256 (note for example column 1, lines 44-50).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoc-Yen M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-2536. The examiner is currently on Part time schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on (703) 308-3837. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



Ngoc-Yen M. Nguyen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1754

nmn  
February 24, 2003